

Online Comment by User: 206giff

Submitted on: 10/5/2006 12:58:00 AM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98102

Comment:

- I-0001-001** | We are homeowners in the Eastlake neighborhood. We are strongly opposed to expanding the SR520 bridge to 6 lanes and to the Pacific Street Interchange. We are supportive instead, of the \$1.6 billion less expensive 4 lane alternative.
- I-0001-002** | The cost of the four lane alternative should be reduced even further through the use of current-sized lanes and shoulders, and establishing "congestion pricing" tolls along with rush hour lane conversion to transit and HOV use. As senior citizens on fixed incomes, we are acutely aware of needing to live within a budget. We insist our local and state governments do so as well.
- I-0001-003** | Environmentally, the adverse impact on the Arboretum, Union Bay wetlands, Foster Island, and most surrounding neighborhoods would be unimaginable. While the Mayor's office is desirous of eliminating ugly viaduct concrete from the Elliott Bay waterfront, the SR520 expansion proposal would be adding a like amount to our own neighborhood. The noise levels were unfairly addressed by the EIS. With equal lid treatments, the 4 lane proposal would assuredly produce less noise impact.
- I-0001-004** | Further consideration of the 6 lane, Pacific Interchange grand scheme will merely compound our existing traffic problems and is counter to our need to reduce greenhouse gases and their contribution to global warming effects. The public must be encouraged to transition from one driver, one car, into HOV and public transit instead. Our very future, not to mention that of our children, depends on it.
- I-0001-005** | Further consideration of the 6 lane, Pacific Interchange grand scheme will merely compound our existing traffic problems and is counter to our need to reduce greenhouse gases and their contribution to global warming effects. The public must be encouraged to transition from one driver, one car, into HOV and public transit instead. Our very future, not to mention that of our children, depends on it.
- I-0001-006** | We are steadfastly opposed to the SR520 six lane/Pacific Street Interchange proposal and strongly urge that it be dropped from consideration.

Sincerely,

Mr and Mrs Gifford T. Jones
Seattle, WA

I-0001-001

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0001-002

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0001-003

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0001-004

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0001-005

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0001-006

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.